# REMARKS

This submission is in response to the Office Action dated November 15, 2007.

Applicant has amended the specification in paragraph [0017] and [0019] to correct inadvertent typographical errors. Applicant has further amended claims 11, 2, 14, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 42. Support for the amendments is found in the specification at least in paragraphs [0019], [0023] – [0026], [0028], and [0029] in view of FIGS. 1-6. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by the amendments set forth herein. Claims 1, 2, 14, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 42 have been amended. Consequently, claims 1-42 are pending in this application.

## *§ 101 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 1-43 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 101, because allegedly they did not provide a concrete, tangible and useful result. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 29 and 36 to provide an operation of sending the auto reply email message. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-43 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 101.

## *§ 102 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 1, 2, 14, 23, 27, 29 and 31 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Smith, *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 20030172133) (hereinafter "Smith").

Smith is directed to providing a helpdesk service. Smith discloses receiving an electronic request (*e.g.,* via email) 20 from a user for help on a specified problem, automatically performing a search 22 in a knowledge base system to find potential solutions to the problem, and assigning a confidence rating to each potential solution found. If any potential solutions are found with confidence ratings greater than a threshold value (*e.g.,* confidence > 75%) 28, they are automatically returned (*e.g.,* via email) 30 to the user without involving a human agent. If no potential solution is found with a confidence rating greater than a threshold value, the request is automatically passed 33 to a human agent for action. Any potential solutions with confidence

ratings lower than the threshold value but greater than a second lower threshold value are automatically presented 31 to the agent as suggested solutions. (See Smith, Abstract and pars. [0034] – [0051] in view of FIG. 2). Smith also discloses that email handler 14 uses the customer's SMPT address in the received email to look up customer's details in customer database 12 of FIG. 1, or alternatively, to save the address (See Smith, par. [0037] in view of FIGS. 1 and 2). The email handler 14 sends an email reply to the customer, using a mail template, including the solution identity, title, text describing the solution, and call number. (See Smith, par. [0045] in view of FIGS. 1 and 2).

In traversing the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Smith fails to disclose at least "examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1.

Smith does not disclose examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, as particularly recited in claim 1. In accordance with a particular embodiment, the destination address (*e.g.*, no-reply address) of the incoming email may include the following control information: *applid.region.custtype(.arlcount)(.emailid)@noreply.company.com*; where the *applid* identifier defines the application that sent the original message; the region identifier defines the customer's region or location; the *(custtype)* identifier defines the customer's product; the *(arlcount)* identifier defines the number of times an auto reply email has been sent; and the *(emailid)* identifier identifies the sender of the incoming email. (See specification, par. [0018]). Applicant respectfully submits that *Smith does not examine the destination address* of its received email. Rather, Smith's email handler 14 simply uses the SMPT address from the received email to look up a customer's details in customer database 12 of FIG. 1, or alternatively, stores the SMPT address (See Smith, par. [0037] in view of FIGS. 1 and 2). Applicant further respectfully submits that *Smith does not disclose determining whether the SMPT address of the received email indicates an association with an application*, such as, for

example, via the *applid* identifier of the destination address. Thus, Smith does not examine the destination address and further does not determine whether the destination address indicates association with a particular application, as particularly recited in independent claim 1.

Smith does not disclose selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, as particularly recited in independent claim 1. Applicant first respectfully submits that *Smith does not process control information indicated by the destination address*. Smith does not disclose that the SMPT address indicates control information and further Smith does not disclose processing such control information indicated by the SMPT address. Instead, Smith simply uses the SMPT address from the received email to look up a customer's details in customer database 12 of FIG. 1, or alternatively, stores the SMPT address. Applicant further respectfully submits that *Smith does not disclose the use of control information to determine characteristics of the reply email*. That is, Smith's mail template for an email reply is not determined by control information of the SMPT address. (See Smith, par. [0045] in view of FIGS. 1 and 2).

Smith does not disclose generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1. The Examiner alleged on page 3 of the Office Action that at par. [0041] Smith discloses determination of characteristics of the auto reply email. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Smith's par. [0041] discloses extracting a customer's question from the received email for transmission to knowledge base 11, which performs a search for top three solutions to the question. Smith's par. [0045] discloses sending an email and using a template that includes the solutions. Extracting questions from the received email, querying a knowledge base for solutions to the questions and generating a reply email with the solutions does not disclose generating a reply email based on characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address.

Consequently, Smith fails to disclose at least "examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by

the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of independent claim 1. Applicant further respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 2, 14, 23 and 27, based at least on their dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 1.

In traversing the rejection of independent claim 29, Applicant respectfully submits that Smith fails to disclose at least "an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information associated with the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 29.

Applicant respectfully submits that Smith fails to disclose *an auto reply email tool* as particularly recited in independent claims 29. Applicant reiterates that Smith does not disclose examining the destination address to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Smith does not examine its SMPT address to determine whether the SMPT address indicates association of the email with a particular application. Smith further does not disclose selectively processing control information associated with the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and generating the reply email based on the determined characteristics. Specifically, Smith does not disclose its SMPT address is associated with control information, and further that the characteristics of its reply email template are determined by such control information. Thus, the reply email that Smith generates is not based on the characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address.

Consequently, Smith fails to disclose at least "an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information associated with the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 29.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of independent claim 29. Applicant further respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 31, based at least on its dependency from independent claim 29.

### § 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 19, 24, 25, 30 and 38 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Smith.

### Claims 19, 24 and 25

In traversing the rejection of dependent claim 19, 24 and 25, Applicant respectfully submits that Smith fails to teach or suggest "examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1, from which claims 19, 24 and 25 depend either directly or indirectly.

The arguments proffered above in response to the § 102 rejection of claim 1 over Smith are applicable herein and are set forth herein by reference.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 19, 24 and 25, based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 1.

*Claim 30*

In traversing the rejection of dependent claim 30, Applicant respectfully submits that Smith fails to teach or suggest at least "an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information associated with the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 29 from which claims 30 depends.

The arguments proffered above in response to the § 102 rejection of claim 29 over Smith are applicable herein and are set forth herein by reference.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 30, based at least on its dependency from independent claim 29.

*Claim 38*

In traversing the rejection of dependent claim 38, Applicant respectfully submits that Smith fails to teach or suggest an auto reply email tool as particularly recited in independent claims 36 from which claims 38 depends.

Applicant respectfully reiterates that Smith does not teach or suggest examining the destination address to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming

email is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Smith does not examine its SMPT address to determine whether the SMPT address indicates association of the email with a particular application. Smith further does not teach or suggest selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and generating the reply email that links a sender of the incoming email to a customer feedback tool based on the determined characteristics. Specifically, Smith does not teach or suggest its SMPT address indicates control information, and further that the characteristics of its reply email template are determined by such control information. Thus, the reply email that Smith generates is not based on the characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address.

Consequently, Smith fails to teach or suggest at least "an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email that links a sender of the incoming email to a customer feedback tool based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 36 from which claims 38 depends.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent 38, based at least on its dependency from independent claim 36.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 12 and 35 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Carey (U.S. Pub. No. 20030025943).

Carey is directed to an automated inquiry-response email based content delivery system. (See Carey Abstract in view of FIGS. 1 and 2). Server 130 receives a first email message from a user. The email address of the server 130 is published or made available to the user. (See Carey, par. [0034]). *Server 130 assigns a tracking code for the inquiry-response transaction initiated*

*by the receipt of the first email message.* (See Carey, par. [0035]). The server 130 responds to the first email message with a prompt email message, which may include the assigned tracking code for the inquiry-response transaction. The tracking code may be placed in the subject (*i.e.,* "Re:") portion of the prompt email message. (See Carey, par. [0037]). The user may then reply to the prompt email message with a second email message. *The server 130 receives the second email message from the user and the server 130 parses the second email message to identify the tracking code.* Thus, the server 130 can detect that the second email message is associated with the first email message. (See Carey, pars. [0039] and [0040]). The server 130 responds to the second email message with a response email message that includes items of content (or addresses of items of content) corresponding to content order codes in the second email message. (See Carey, pars. [0043]).

## Claims 3, 4, 7 and 12

In traversing the rejection of dependent claims 3, 4, 7 and 12, Applicant respectfully submits that the Smith-Carey combination fails to teach or suggest at least "examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 3, 4, 7 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly.

The Smith-Carey combination does not teach or suggest examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Applicant respectfully submits that the primary reference to Smith does not teach or suggest examining the destination address to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Smith does not examine its SMPT address to determine whether the SMPT address indicates association of the email with a particular application. The secondary cited reference to Carey does not rectify this deficiency in Smith. Carey also does not teach or

suggest examining the destination address (email address for the server 130) in its second email message to determine whether the destination address indicates association of the second email message with a particular application. Specifically, Carey's tracking code is not indicated by the destination address of the second email message. That is, the tracking code is part of the subject portion of the second email message. Further, the Carey tracking code does not indicate the association of the second email message with a particular application. Rather, Carey's tracking code indicates association of the second email message with the inquiry-response transaction initiated by the receipt of the first email message.

The Smith-Carey combination further does not teach or suggest selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and generating the reply email. Specifically, Smith does not teach or suggest that its SMPT address includes control information, selectively processing the control information, and further that the characteristics of its reply email template are determined by such control information. Carey does not rectify these deficiencies in Smith. Carrey does not teach or suggest that its destination address (email address for the server 130) includes control information. Further, Carrey's tracking code in the second email message does not determine characteristics of the response email message, which responds to the second email message. Specifically, Carey's tracking code indicates association of the second email message with the inquiry-response transaction initiated by the receipt of the first email message. Thus, the reply email that the Smith-Carey combination generates is not based on the characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address.

Consequently, Smith fails to teach or suggest at least "examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 3, 4, 7 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 3, 4, 7 and 12, based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 1.

*Claim 35*

In traversing the rejection of dependent claim 35, Applicant respectfully submits that the Smith-Carey combination fails to teach or suggest at least "an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information associated with the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 29 from which claim 35 depends.

The Smith-Carey combination does not teach or suggest examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Applicant respectfully submits that the primary reference to Smith does not teach or suggest examining the destination address to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Smith does not examine its SMPT address to determine whether the SMPT address indicates association of the email with a particular application. The secondary cited reference to Carrey does not rectify this deficiency in Smith. Carey also does not teach or suggest examining the destination address (email address for the server 130) in its second email message to determine whether the destination address indicates association of the second email message with a particular application. Specifically, the Carey's tracking code is not indicated by the destination address of the second email message. That is, the tracking code is part of the subject portion of the second email message. Further, the Carey tracking code does not indicate the association of the second email message with a particular application. Rather, Carey's tracking code indicates association of the second email message with the inquiry-response transaction initiated by the receipt of the first email message.

The Smith-Carey combination further does not teach or suggest selectively processing control information associated with the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and generating the reply email based on the determined characteristics. Specifically, Smith does not teach or suggest that its SMPT address is associated with control information, selectively processing the control information, and further that the characteristics of its reply email template are determined by such control information. Carey does not rectify these deficiencies in Smith. Carrey does not teach or suggest that its destination address (email address for the server 130) includes control information. Further, Carrey's tracking code in the second email message does not determine characteristics of the response email message, which responds to the second email message. Specifically, Carey's tracking code indicates association of the second email message with the inquiry-response transaction initiated by the receipt of the first email message. Thus, the reply email that the hypothetical Smith-Carey combination would generate is not based on the characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address.

Consequently, Smith fails to teach or suggest at least "an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 29 from which claim 35 depends.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claim 35, based at least on its dependency from independent claim 29.

Claims 5, 6, 21, 22, 26, 28, 32, 33, 36, 37 and 39-43 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Carey and in view of Matthews, *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,865,268) (hereinafter "Matthews").

Matthews is directed to real-time call tracking for web-based customer relationship management (See Mathews, Abstract in view of FIGS. 1 and 8). Specifically Matthews teaches an electronic Customer Relationship Management (eCRM) portal engine that provides call tracking management with interactive end-user tools that allow the end user to submit service/call requests via web, email and/or telephone. (See Matthews, Col. 2, lines 54-59). The eCRM portal engine provides an On-Call Board 100 that allows board members visibility to each other's availability 130 and ticket/call assignment 132. (See Mathews, Col 6, lines 1-5 in view of FIG. 1). On-Call Board 100 provides dynamic multiple contact information and channels (email, chat, voice over IP, pager, phone contact information) by clicking on either the staff name 120 for email contact, e-page icon 140 for paging, chat icon 142 for instant messaging, talk icon 144 for VoIP calls, or phone button 140 for list of phone contact information where members select the primary phone number where they can be reached (i.e., home, office cell). (See Mathews, Col. 6, lines 28-37 in view of FIG. 1).

*Claims 5, 6, 21, 22, 26 and 28*

In traversing the rejection of dependent claims 5, 6, 21, 22, 26 and 28, Applicant respectfully submits that the Smith-Carey-Matthews combination fails to teach or suggest at least "examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 5, 6, 21, 22, 26 and 28 depend either directly or indirectly.

The Smith-Carey-Matthews combination does not teach or suggest examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Smith does not teach or suggest examining the destination address to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Smith does not

examine its SMPT address to determine whether the SMPT address indicates association of the email with a particular application. Applicant further respectfully submits that Carrey also does not teach or suggest examining the destination address (email address for the server 130) in its second email message to determine whether the destination address indicates association of the second email message with a particular application. Specifically, the Carey's tracking code is not indicated by the destination address of the second email message and the tracking code does not indicate the association of the second email message with a particular application. Applicant respectfully submits that Matthews does not rectify the deficiency identified in the Smith-Carey combination. Specifically, the On-Call Board 100 of Matthews allows members to send email by clicking staff name 120, but the On-Call Board 100 does not teach or suggest examining the destination address of an incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. That is, Matthews does not examine the destination addresses of the incoming email.

The Smith-Carey-Matthews combination further does not teach or suggest selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and generating the reply email based on the determined characteristics. Specifically, Smith does not teach or suggest its SMPT address including control information, selectively processing the control information, and further that the characteristics of its reply email template are determined by such control information. Applicant further submits that Carrey does not teach or suggest its destination address (email address for the server 130) indicates control information. Further, the Carrey's tracking code in the second email message does not determine characteristics of the response email message, which responds to the second email message. Specifically, the Carey's tracking code indicates association of the second email message with the inquiry-response transaction initiated by the receipt of the first email message. Matthews does not rectify the deficiencies identified in the Smith-Carey combination. Specifically, the On-Call Board 100 of Matthews allows members to send email by clicking staff name 120, but the On-Call Board 100 does not teach or suggest selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and further generating the reply email based on the determined characteristics. That is, Matthews does not teach or suggest that the emails of the On-Call Board 100 include control

information indicated by destination addresses of emails. Thus, the reply email that the hypothetical Smith-Carey-Matthews combination generates is not based on the characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address.

Consequently, the Smith-Carey-Matthews combination fails to teach or suggest at least "examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 5, 6, 21, 22, 26 and 28 depend either directly or indirectly.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 5, 6, 21, 22, 26 and 28, based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 1.

*Claims 32 and 33*

In traversing the rejection of dependent claims 32 and 33, Applicant respectfully submits that the Smith-Carey-Matthews combination fails to teach or suggest at least "an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information associated with the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 29 from which claims 32 and 33 depend.

The Smith-Carey-Matthews combination does not teach or suggest examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Applicant respectfully submits that the primary reference to Smith does not teach or suggest examining the destination

address to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Smith does not examine its SMPT address to determine whether the SMPT address indicates association of the email with a particular application. Applicant also submits that Carrey does not teach or suggest examining the destination address (email address for the server 130) in its second email message to determine whether the destination address indicates association of the second email message with a particular application. Specifically, the Carey's tracking code is not indicated by the destination address of the second email message. That is, the tracking code is part of the subject portion of the second email message. Further, the Carey tracking code does not indicate the association of the second email message with a particular application. Specifically, Carey's tracking code indicates association of the second email message with the inquiry-response transaction initiated by the receipt of the first email message. Matthews does not rectify the deficiencies identified in the Smith-Carey combination. Specifically, the On-Call Board 100 of Matthews allows members to send email by clicking staff name 120, but the On-Call Board 100 does not teach or suggest examining the destination address of an incoming email and further determining whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. That is, Matthews does not examine destination addresses of incoming email.

The Smith-Carey-Mathews combination further does not teach or suggest selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and generating the reply email based on the determined characteristics. Specifically, Smith does not teach or suggest that its SMPT address is associated with control information, selectively processing the control information, and further that the characteristics of its reply email template are determined by such control information. Applicant also submits that Carrey does not teach or suggest its destination address (email address for the server 130) includes control information. Further, the Carrey's tracking code in the second email message does not determine characteristics of the response email message, which responds to the second email message. Specifically, the Carey's tracking code indicates association of the second email message with the inquiry-response transaction initiated by the receipt of the first email message. Matthews does not rectify the deficiencies identified in the Smith-Carey combination. Specifically, the On-Call Board 100 of Matthews allows members to send email by clicking staff

name 120, but the On-Call Board 100 does not teach or suggest selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and further generating the reply email based on the determined characteristics. That is, Matthews does not teach or suggest that the emails of the On-Call Board 100 include control information indicated by destination addresses of emails. Thus, the reply email that the hypothetical Smith-Carey-Matthews combination generates is not based on the characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address.

Consequently, the Smith-Carey-Matthews combination fails to teach or suggest at least "an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information associated with the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 29 from which claims 32 and 33 depend.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 32 and 33, based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 29.

*Claims 36, 37 and 39-43*

In traversing the rejection of independent claims 36, Applicant respectfully submits that the Smith-Carey-Matthews combination fails to teach or suggest at least "a system comprising an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email to the incoming email that links a sender of the incoming email to a customer feedback tool based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 36.

Applicant respectfully reiterates the Smith-Carey-Matthews combination does not teach or suggest examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Applicant further respectfully reiterates that the reply email that the hypothetical Smith-Carey-Matthews combination generates is not based on the characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address of received email. Still further, neither of the references, whether alone or in combination, teaches or suggests generating an auto reply email linking a sender of the incoming email to a customer feedback tool based on characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address of received email. That is, the Smith-Carey-Matthews combination does not determine characteristics of the auto reply email from control information indicated by the destination address of received email.

Consequently, the Smith-Carey-Matthews combination fails to teach or suggest at least "a system comprising an auto reply email tool configured to examine destination addresses of the incoming emails to determine whether a destination address of an incoming email indicates the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively process control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generate the auto reply email to the incoming email that links a sender of the incoming email to a customer feedback tool based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 36.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of independent claims 36, as well as, dependent claims 37 and 39-43, based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 36.

Claims 8-13 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Smith in view Tomono (U.S. Pub. No. 20030177189).

Tomono is directed to an email control apparatus 101, which replaces the sender's 113 original email address to receiver 117 with a dummy email address related to the sender's original address. Tomono further teaches delivery to sender 113 of reply emails received from the receiver 117 using conversion data, *i.e.,* during a preset time period (before expiration date) or for a preset number of times (less than an allowable number of replies). The control apparatus 101 maintains the conversion data (expiration date and allowable reply number) in a conversion database 111. When a reply to a sender's 113 email (including the dummy destination address) is received from the receiver 117, the control apparatus 101 determines whether the reply email is before the expiration date and whether the reply email has not exceeded the preset number of replies using conversion data in database 111. If so, the dummy destination address of the received reply email is converted to (replaced with) sender's original email address using the conversion data in database 111. Because the receiver 117 does not know the sender's 113 true email address, the reply email may not be transmitted to the sender 113 if the reply email is after the expiration date or has exceeded the number of replies. (See Tomono, pars. [0044] - [0056] in view of FIGS. 5 - 7).

In traversing the rejection of dependent claims 8-13, Applicant respectfully submits that the Smith-Tomono combination fails to teach or suggest at least "examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 8-13 depend either directly or indirectly.

The Smith-Tomono combination does not teach or suggest examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Applicant respectfully reiterates that the primary reference to Smith does not teach or suggest examining the destination address to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Smith does not examine its SMPT address to determine

whether the SMPT address indicates association of the email with a particular application. Tomono does not rectify this deficiency. Tomono does not teach or suggest examining the destination address of the received reply email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming reply email is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Tomono does not examine the destination address of its received reply email. Tomono's control apparatus 101 only determines whether the reply email (addressed to a dummy destination address) is received before the expiration date and whether the reply email has not exceeded the preset number of replies using conversion data in database 111, and if so, control apparatus 101 replaces the dummy destination address of the received reply email with the sender's original destination address from the database 111. Tomono further does not determine whether the destination address (dummy destination address) of the received reply message indicates association of the received reply email with a particular application.

The Smith-Tomono combination further does not teach or suggest selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and generating the reply email based on the determined characteristics. Specifically, Smith does not teach or suggest its SMPT address including control information, selectively processing the control information, and further that the characteristics of its reply email template are determined by such control information. Tomono does not rectify the deficiencies identified in Smith. Specifically, Tomono's destination address (dummy address) of the received reply email does not include control information and Tomono does not process the control information to determine characteristics of an auto reply email. Thus, the reply email that the hypothetical Smith-Tomono combination generates is not based on the characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address.

Consequently, the Smith-Tomono combination fails to teach or suggest at least examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply

email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 8-13 depend either directly or indirectly.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 8-13, based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 1.

Claims 15-18 and 20 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Smith in view Dezonno (U.S. Pub. No. 20030172185).

Dezonno is directed to transmitting customized messages from an agent to a caller during noon-voice dialog communication. Specifically, automatic call distribution (ACD) system 16 distributes both _voice dialog_ and _non-voice dialog_ communications from callers 20, 22, 24 (customers) to agent stations 30, each of which includes an agent station computer 32 and /or telephone 34. (See Dezonno, pars. [0014] and [0016] in view of FIG. 1). Communication processor 56, which may be separate from or integrated into ACD system 16, facilitates sending and receiving of _non-voice communication_ between the caller 20, 22, 24 and the agent 30. Communication processor 56 creates a "call appearance" that simulates to the ACD system 16 the appearance of a voice-type call. The ACD system 16 queues and tracks the non-voice dialog communication to the appropriate agent 30. (See Dezonno, pars. [0022] and [0023]). _The non-voice dialog communication, such as email, chat room and instant message, may include a greeting, a discussion and a farewell message._ (See Dezonno, par. [0025]).

During non-voice dialog communication, the agent display screen 61 displays a dialog box 64 of text sent from the caller 20, 22, 24 to the agent 30 and a dialog box 66 of text sent from the agent 30 to the caller 20, 22, 24. (See Dezonno, par. [0032] in view of FIGS. 3 and 4). The agent 30 populates some or all of the text storage locations 84 on the display screen 61 with data (_e.g.,_ caller name, account no., product ID, etc.) from the caller's dialog 64. (See Dezonno, pars. [0035], [0036] and [0038]). _After text storage locations 84 have been populated, the information contained in the text storage locations 84 is then inserted into a template text message._ The communication processor 56 provides plural template text messages ("canned" or

preprogrammed messages) that are customizable in part, but various blank portions of the text messages are configured to receive corresponding data stored in the text storage locations 84. (See Dezonno, par. [0043] in view of FIGS. 4). The customized text messages (filled in with corresponding data from text storage location 84) may then be transmitted from the agent 30 to the caller 20, 22, 24. (See Dezonno, par. [0051]).

In traversing the rejection of dependent claims 15-18 and 20, Applicant respectfully submits that the Smith-Dezonno combination fails to teach or suggest at least "examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 15-18 and 20 depend either directly or indirectly.

The Smith-Dezonno combination does not teach or suggest examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Applicant respectfully reiterates that the primary reference to Smith does not teach or suggest examining the destination address to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Smith does not examine its SMPT address to determine whether the SMPT address indicates association of the email with a particular application. Dezonno does not rectify this deficiency. Although Dezonno teaches that the non-voice dialog communication can be an email (See Dezonno, par. [0025]), Dezonno does not teach or suggest examining the destination address of its received non-voice communication to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming non-voice communication is associated with a particular application. Specifically, Dezonno's ACD system 16 only distributes *non-voice dialog* communication received from a caller 20, 22 or 24 to an agent station 30. However, Dezonno does not examine the destination address of the non-voice communication, and further does not determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming non-voice communication is associated with a particular application.

The Smith-Dezonno combination further does not teach or suggest selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address to determine characteristics of an auto reply email and generating the reply email based on the determined characteristics. Specifically, Smith does not teach or suggest its SMPT address including control information, selectively processing the control information, and further that the characteristics of its reply email template are determined by such control information. Dezonno does not rectify the deficiencies identified in the Smith. Although Dezonno teaches that the non-voice dialog communication can be an email (See Dezonno, par. [0025]), Dezonno does not teach or suggest that a destination address of the non-voice dialog communication includes control information. Further, Dezonno does not process this control information to determine characteristics of an auto reply email. Rather, Dezonno provides plural templates for non-voice dialog communication that are not associated with control information indicated by the destination address. Thus, the reply email that the hypothetical Smith-Dezonno combination generates is not based on the characteristics determined from control information indicated by the destination address.

Consequently, the Smith-Dezonno combination fails to teach or suggest at least examining a destination address of the incoming email to determine whether the destination address indicates that the incoming email is associated with a particular application, selectively processing control information indicated by the destination address of the incoming email to determine characteristics of an auto reply email to the incoming email, generating the auto reply email based on the determined characteristics," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 15-18 and 20 depend either directly or indirectly.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 15-18 and 20, based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 1.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant has pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious by the reference applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

2-15-2008
_____
Date

_____
Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER LAW GROUP
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)